REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

Claim 1 has been amended herein to overcome the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

As to the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1, 10, 15 and 24 regarding the term "geocode", geocode is defined in the bottom three lines of page 6 of the present Specification. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

As to the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 2 and 16, it is respectfully submitted that these claims do further limit the claims that they depend on by reciting that the geographical map can be any form of map including a registered satellite image. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Maruyama (US Patent 6,430,498 B1) in view of Budge (USP Publication 2002/0080408 A1) and Ogawa (USP 5,864,632) and Ratnakar (USP 6,278,432 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons:

Independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended herein to recite that the present invention provide for retrieving geographical images from a geographical map image storage database, the geographical map image storage database being dedicated to storing only geographical raster maps or satellite image therein and retrieving information from the spatial database using meta data and geocode of the coordinate related with the geographical elements on the vector data, the vector database being dedicated to storing only vector data therein.

The patent to Maruyama, cited by the Examiner as the base reference of the rejection, merges the spatial database and the geographical map image onto a single database called Spatial Information Database, which is compressed and then transformed to the internet network. The separation between the spatial database and the geographical map image as claimed in the claimed invention creates a better result from Maruyama because both databases contain different kinds of information and therefore a compressing method must be suitable for each type of information in order to be efficient compression. The compression of raster data may use a lossy compression method, while compression of vector data cannot use the same method. The separation of databases for the claimed invention prevents any errors from transforming wrong information for use.

Claims 6, 14 and 20 have been amended to correct grammatical errors therein.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn and that the claims remaining in the present application be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By: _____
Richard B. Klar
Registration No. 31,385

CUSTOMER NO. 01109

Anderson Kill & Olick, P.C.
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020-1182
(212) 278-1000

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this AMENDMENT in response to the Office Action of November 28, 2003 with request for a 3-month Extension of Time is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on May 25, 2004.

Audrey De Souza (Typed or printed name of person mailing paper or fee)

_____ (Signature of person mailing paper or fee)